

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 16, 2007. Claims 1-7 and 9 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1 and 7 are in independent form. Claims 1, 4, 7 and 9 have been amended to define Applicant's invention more clearly, and Claim 8 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, and will not be mentioned further. The title has been amended to make it more descriptive, as required on page 2 of the Office Action. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

An Information Disclosure Statement and a corresponding PTO-1449 form were submitted on May 23, 2007, and a Second Information Disclosure Statement is being filed herewith. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner return an initialed copy of both PTO-1449 forms, indicating that the references listed thereon have been considered and made of record in the present application, with his next paper.

The Office Action states that the title of the invention is not descriptive. The title has been amended to read as follows: --IMAGE PROCESSING APPARATUS WHICH SCANS LOCATION INFORMATION TO AUTHENTICATE PRINTING AN ORIGINAL IMAGE--. Applicant respectfully submits that the title, as amended, is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claims 4 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Those claims have been carefully reviewed and amended as deemed necessary to ensure that they conform fully to the requirements of Section 112, second paragraph, with special attention to the points raised in paragraphs five and six of the Office Action. It is

believed that the rejections under Section 112, second paragraph, have been obviated, and their withdrawal is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,137,590 (*Mori*). Claims 3 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mori* in view of Official Notice. Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mori* in view of Applicant's alleged admitted prior art. Applicant submits that independent Claims 1 and 7, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 is directed to an image processing apparatus comprising a read means, an authentication means, a search means, a setting means, and an output means. The read means reads an image on a document that contains image storage information representing a location where an original image of the document is stored. The authentication means authenticates whether a user can utilize an original image of the document. The search means searches the original image of the document from an image storage device which stores the original image of the document on the basis of the image storage information when the user is authenticated by said authentication means. The setting means sets a destination for the original image of the document in accordance with the user authenticated by said authentication means. The output means for outputs the original image of the document searched by said search means to the destination set by said setting means.

Among other features of Claim 1 is the setting means for setting a destination for an original image of a document in accordance with the user authenticated by the authentication means. This feature is supported by the specification at page 57, lines 16-19: "If

YES in S3503, the flow advances to S3507, and the control apparatus 110 automatically selects the address of the authenticated user as a transmission destination.”^{1/} By virtue of the this feature of Claim 1, it is possible to prevent the inconvenience of having an original image of a document inadvertently output to an arbitrary destination.

Mori relates to an image forming apparatus for receiving printable image data from an external machine, converting the received image data into a print image, and printing the image. *Mori* does not disclose the setting means for setting a destination for an original image of a document in accordance with the user authenticated by the authentication means, as set forth in Claim 1. At most, *Mori* merely discusses that an original image is printed by the specific image forming apparatus. In the *Mori* system the output apparently is routed to only one default destination whose location is not set. Thus, the *Mori* apparatus does not appear to include or need setting means, as set forth in Claim 1, because the apparatus in *Mori* sends all output to only one destination.

For at least this reason, Applicant believes that Claim 1 is patentable over *Mori*.

Independent Claim 7 is a method claim corresponding to apparatus Claim 1, and is believed to be patentable for similar reasons.

The other claims in this application depend from Claim 1, and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim also is

^{1/} It is of course to be understood that the claim scope is not limited by the details of this or any other particular embodiment that may be referred to.

deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard P Diana/
Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 1529019v1